arXiv:1510.02316v1 [math.SP] 8 Oct 2015

AN ALTERNATIVE PROOF OF THE A PRIORI TANΘ THEOREM

ALEXANDER K. MOTOVILOV

ABSTRACT. Let A be a self-adjoint operator in a separable Hilbert space. Suppose that the spectrum of A is formed of two isolated components σ_0 and σ_1 such that the set σ_0 lies in a finite gap of the set σ_1. Assume that V is a bounded additive self-adjoint perturbation of A, off-diagonal with respect to the partition $\mathrm{spec}(A)=\sigma_0\cup\sigma_1$. It is known that if $\|V\|<\sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{dist}(\sigma_0,\sigma_1)$, then the spectrum of the perturbed operator $L=A+V$ consists of two disjoint parts ω_0 and ω_1 which originate from the corresponding initial spectral subsets σ_0 and σ_1. Moreover, for the difference of the spectral projections $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)$ and $\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)$ of A and L associated with the spectral sets σ_0 and ω_0, respectively, the following sharp norm bound holds:

$$\|\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)-\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\|\leq\sin\left(\arctan\frac{\|V\|}{\mathrm{dist}(\sigma_0,\sigma_1)}\right).$$

In the present note, we give a new proof of this bound for $\|V\|<\mathrm{dist}(\sigma_0,\sigma_1)$.

Dedicated to the memory of my university advisor Stanislav Petrovich Merkuriev

1. INTRODUCTION

One of fundamental problems in perturbation theory of linear operators consists in the study of variation of invariant and, in particular, spectral subspaces under an additive perturbation (see, e.g., [1, 2, 3]). In perturbation theory of self-adjoint operators, the classical trigonometric estimates on the rotation of spectral subspaces have been established by Davis and Kahan [2]. As regards the history of the subject and surveys on other known subspace variation bounds in the self-adjoint perturbation problem, we refer the reader, e.g., to [4, 5, 6].

The author's interest to the subspace perturbation theory arose due to a series of works performed with a very immediate participation of S.P.Merkuriev and devoted to the construction of three-body Hamiltoninas with pairwise interactions depending on the energies of two-body subsystems (in particular, see papers [7, 8] and references therein). The attempts [9, 10] to answer the question [11] on the possibility to replace, in the two-body Schrödinger equation, a pairwise energy-dependent potential by a spectrally equivalent (i.e. keeping the original spectrum and original eigenfunctions) energy-independent potential led the author to a study of the solvability of an operator Riccati equation. Actually, the mentioned question on the replacement of the energy-dependent potential by an equivalent energy-independent one is related to a more general question on the Markus-Matsaev-type factorization of operator-valued functions of the complex variable and the existence of operator roots for those functions (see [12, 13, 14]). The Schrödinger operator with a potential depending on the energy like a resolvent represents an example of the operator-valued function, the construction of operator roots for which necessarily reduces to the search for graph representations of invariant subspaces for some 2×2 block

Key words and phrases. Perturbation problem for spectral subspaces, operator Riccati equation, $\tan\theta$ theorem.

operator matrix (see [9, 12, 14, 15, 16]). In its turn, answering the question on the existence of the graph representations leads to the study of mutual geometry of unperturbed and perturbed invariant subspaces and, among other things, to the study of spectral properties of the operator angles between these subspaces (see [17] and references cited therein).

In the present work we consider a particular case of the self-adjoint subspace perturbation problem. Namely, we suppose that the spectrum $\mathrm{spec}(A)$ of the initial self-adjoint operator A, acting in a separable Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$, consists of a two disjoint parts σ_0 and σ_1 such that the first of them lies in a finite gap of the second one. (We recall that by a finite gap of a closed set $\sigma \subset \mathbb{R}$ one understands an open bounded interval on $\mathbb{R}$ that does not intersect σ but both of its ends belong to σ.) For future references, we write our assumption on the mutual position of the spectral components σ_0 and σ_1 in the following form:

$$\mathrm{spec}(A) = \sigma_0 \cup \sigma_1, \quad \overline{\mathrm{conv}(\sigma_0)} \cap \overline{\sigma}_1 = \varnothing \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_0 \subset \mathrm{conv}(\sigma_1), \tag{1.1}$$

where the symbol conv denotes the convex hull, and the overlining means closure.

As for the (additive) perturbation V, we assume that it is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\mathfrak{H}$. Furthermore, it is supposed that this perturbation is off-diagonal with respect to the partition $\mathrm{spec}(A) = \sigma_0 \cup \sigma_1$, which means that V anticommutes with the difference $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0) - \mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_1)$ of the spectral projections $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)$ and $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_1)$ of A corresponding to the spectral sets σ_0 and σ_1.

Let $d := \mathrm{dist}(\sigma_0, \sigma_1)$ be the distance between the sets σ_0 and σ_1. For the spectral disposition (1.1), it has been established in [18] (also see [15]) that the gaps between σ_0 and σ_1 do not close under an off-diagonal self-adjoint perturbation V if its norm satisfies the condition

$$\|V\| < \sqrt{2}\, d. \tag{1.2}$$

Moreover, this condition is optimal. If (1.2) holds, the spectrum of the perturbed operator $L = A + V$ is represented by the union of two isolated sets $\omega_0 \subset \Delta$ and $\omega_1 \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \Delta$ where Δ stands just for the very same finite gap of the spectral set σ_1 that contains the whole complementary spectral set σ_0.

For the spectral disposition (1.1) and off-diagonal self-adjoint perturbations V, the optimal bound on the variation of the spectral subspaces of a self-adjoint operator has been established, step by step, in papers [19] (for the case where $\|V\| < d$) and [20] (for $d \leq \|V\| < \sqrt{2}d$); it is written in terms of the difference of the respective spectral projections $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)$ and $\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)$ of the unperturbed and perturbed operators A and L. We reproduce this bound in the following statement (cf. [19, Theorem 2] and [20, Theorem 1]).

Theorem 1. *Let A be a self-adjoint operator on a separable Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$, and let the spectrum of A consist of a two isolated components σ_0 and σ_1 which satisfy the condition* (1.1)*. Assume that V is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\mathfrak{H}$, off-diagonal with respect to the partition* $\mathrm{spec}(A) = \sigma_0 \cup \sigma_1$*, and set $L = A + V$,* $\mathrm{Dom}(L) = \mathrm{Dom}(A)$*. Furthermore, assume that the norm of V satisfies inequality* (1.2)*, and let $\omega_0 = \mathrm{spec}(L) \cap \Delta$. Then the following norm bound holds:*

$$\|\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0) - \mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\| \leq \sin\left(\arctan\frac{\|V\|}{d}\right). \tag{1.3}$$

Recall that if P and Q are orthogonal projections in a Hilbert space then the quantity

$$\Theta(\mathfrak{P}, \mathfrak{Q}) := \arcsin|P - Q|, \tag{1.4}$$

where $|P-Q| = \sqrt{(P-Q)^2}$ stands for the absolute value of $P - Q$, is called the *operator angle* between the subspaces $\mathfrak{P} = \mathrm{Ran}(P)$ and $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathrm{Ran}(Q)$. A substantial discussion of the term «operator angle» and relevant references may be found, in particular, in the recent paper [21,

Section 2]. In its turn, the norm of the operator angle $\Theta(\mathfrak{P},\mathfrak{Q})$ determines the *maximal angle* $\theta(\mathfrak{P},\mathfrak{Q})$ between $\mathfrak{P}$ $\mathfrak{Q}$ (see [5]). Namely, $\theta(\mathfrak{P},\mathfrak{Q}) = \arcsin\|P-Q\|$.

In view of (1.4) the estimate (1.3) is equivalent to the bound

$$\tan\Theta(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{L}_0) \le \frac{\|V\|}{d} \tag{1.5}$$

for the tangent of the operator angle $\Theta(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{L}_0)$ between unperturbed and perturbed spectral subspaces $\mathfrak{A}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)\big)$ and $\mathfrak{L}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\big)$, respectively. Unlike the Davis-Kahan $\tan\Theta$ theorem [2, Theorem 6.3] and its extensions in [18] and [22], the bound (1.3) involves the distance only between the unperturbed spectral components σ_0 and σ_1. This is why it is called in [19] and [20] the *a priori* $\tan\Theta$ theorem.

The proof of Theorem 1 for $\|V\| < d$ given in [19], is based on the study of location of the spectrum of the product $J'J$ of the self-adjoint involutions $J = \mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0) - \mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_1)$ and $J' = \mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0) - \mathsf{E}_L(\omega_1)$. In this way, the proof in [19] requires a reformulation of the subspace perturbation problem into the language of pairs of involutions. It also relies on a knowledge of certain properties of the polar decomposition for maximal accretive operators.

The present note is aimed at giving a proof of (1.3) that would be independent from the approach suggested in [19]. Moreover, we think that the proof presented below in Section 3 is simpler and more straightforward than the proof in [19]. Our new proof is based on the rather standard technique [16] involving the reduction of the invariant subspace perturbation problem under consideration to the study of the operator Riccati equation

$$XA_0 - A_1X + XBX = B^*, \tag{1.6}$$

where $A_0 = A\big|_{\mathfrak{A}_0}$ and $A_1 = A\big|_{\mathfrak{A}_1}$ are the parts of the self-adjoint operator A in its spectral subspaces $\mathfrak{A}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)\big)$ and $\mathfrak{A}_1 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_1)\big)$, and $B = V\big|_{\mathfrak{A}_1}$. As it was established in [18], the perturbed spectral subspace $\mathfrak{L}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\big)$ is the graph of a solution $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1)$ to equation (1.6). The latter means (see, e.g., [17]) that

$$\|\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0) - \mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\| = \sin\left(\arctan\|X\|\right). \tag{1.7}$$

Thus, when one obtains a bound for the norm of the solution X, one simultaneously finds an estimate for the norm of the difference of the spectral projections $\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)$ and $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)$.

In our derivations we rely on the identities established in [20, Lemma 2.2] for eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the absolute value $|X| = \sqrt{X^*X}$ of the operator X. Starting from these identities (more precisely, from the identities (2.6) and (2.7) below), we obtain, for $\|\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0) - \mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\|$, a bound (3.2) which is stronger but more detail than the estimate (1.3): The bound (3.2) involves, along with $\|V\|$ and d, also the length $|\Delta|$ of the gap Δ. The estimate (3.2) reproduces the main result of [19, Theorem 5.3]. Just the proof of this estimate, alternative to the proof in [19], we consider as the principal result of the present work. It was already pointed out in [19] that the bound (1.3) is nothing but a simple corollary to the more detail estimate (3.2).

Let us describe the structure of the paper. Alongside with the already mentioned identities (2.6) and (2.7) for eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the absolute value of the solution to the Riccati equation (1.6), Section 2 contains a selection of known results concerning the location of the spectrum of the perturbed operator $L = A+V$ and the solvability of (1.6) under the weaker than (1.2) but more detail condition $\|V\| < \sqrt{d|\Delta|}$. The principal result of the work — the new proof of the bound on rotation of the spectral subspace $\mathfrak{A}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)\big)$ under an off-diagonal perturbation V satisfying condition $\|V\| < \sqrt{d(|\Delta|-d)}$ — is presented in Section 3 (see Theorem 3.1). Section 3 comes to the end with the proof of Theorem 1.

Throughout the paper, by a subspace we always understand a closed linear subset of a Hilbert space. The notation $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{M},\mathfrak{N})$ is applied to the Banach space of bounded linear operators from a Hilbert space $\mathfrak{M}$ to a Hilbert space $\mathfrak{N}$. The orthogonal sum of two Hilbert spaces (or orthogonal subspaces) $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{N}$ is denoted by $\mathfrak{M}\oplus\mathfrak{N}$. The graph $\mathcal{G}(K) := \{y \in \mathfrak{M}\oplus\mathfrak{N} \,|\, y = x \oplus Kx,\ x \in \mathfrak{M}\}$ of an operator $K \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{M},\mathfrak{N})$ is called the graph subspace associated with K. At the same time, the operator K itself is called the angular operator associated with the ordered pair $\big(\mathfrak{M},\mathfrak{K}\big)$ of the subspaces $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{K} = \mathcal{G}(K)$. The notations $\mathrm{Dom}(Z)$ and $\mathrm{Ran}(Z)$ are used respectively for the domain and the range of a linear operator Z.

2. Preliminaries

It is convenient for us to use a block matrix representation of the operators under consideration. Thus, we adopt the following hypothesis (notice that this hypothesis does not yet concern the mutual position of the spectra of the operators A_0 and A_1).

Hypothesis 2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{A}_0$ and $\mathfrak{A}_1$ be complementary orthogonal subspaces of a separable Hilbert space $\mathfrak{H}$, i.e. $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{A}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{A}_1$. Assume that A is a self-adjoint operator in $\mathfrak{H}$ admitting the block diagonal matrix representation*

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathrm{Dom}(A) = \mathfrak{A}_0 \oplus \mathrm{Dom}(A_1), \tag{2.1}$$

where A_0 is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\mathfrak{A}_0$, and A_1, a possibly unbounded self-adjoint operator in $\mathfrak{A}_1$. Let V be a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\mathfrak{H}$, off-diagonal with respect to the decomposition $\mathfrak{H} = \mathfrak{A}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{A}_1$, that is,

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & B \\ B^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $0 \neq B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_1,\mathfrak{A}_0)$. Assume that $L = A + V$, $\mathrm{Dom}(L) = \mathrm{Dom}(A)$, and, hence,

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & B \\ B^* & A_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathrm{Dom}(L) = \mathfrak{A}_0 \oplus \mathrm{Dom}(A_1). \tag{2.3}$$

Under Hypothesis 2.1, an operator $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_0,\mathfrak{A}_1)$ is said to be a solution to the operator Riccati equation (1.6) if

$$\mathrm{Ran}(X) \subset \mathrm{Dom}(A_1) \tag{2.4}$$

and equality (1.6) holds as an operator identity (cf., e.g., [16, Definition 3.1]). Clearly, the solution X (if it exists) may only be non-zero. Otherwise, $X = 0$ would imply that $B = 0$, which contradicts the assumption. In what follows, by U we denote the partial isometry in the polar decomposition $X = U|X|$ of the solution X. In particular, for U we have

$$U \ \text{ is an isometry on } \ \mathrm{Ran}(|X|) = \mathrm{Ran}(X^*). \tag{2.5}$$

We adopt the convention that the action of U is trivially extended onto the kernel $\mathrm{Ker}(X) = \mathrm{Ker}(|X|)$ of X, i.e.

$$U|_{\mathrm{Ker}(X)} = 0.$$

In such a case the operator U is uniquely defined on all the subspace $\mathfrak{A}_0$ (see, e.g., [23, Theorem 8.1.2]).

We will need two identities for eigenvalues and eigenvectors (in case if they exist) of the absolute value $|X|$. The first of these identities has been established in [20, Lemma 2.2]. The second identity trivially follows from other identities also proven in [20, Lemma 2.2].

Lemma 2.2 ([20])**.** *Assume Hypothesis 2.1. Suppose that the Riccati equation* (1.6) *possesses a solution $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1)$ and that the absolute value $|X|$ of this solution has an eigenvalue $\lambda \geq 0$. Let u, $u \neq 0$, be an eigenvector of $|X|$ corresponding to the eigenvalue λ, i.e. $|X|u = \lambda u$. If U is the isometry from the polar decomposition $X = U|X|$ of X, then $Uu \in \mathrm{Dom}(A_1)$ and the following two identities hold:*

$$\lambda\big(\|A_1Uu\|^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - \|A_0u\|^2 - \|B^*u\|^2\big) \\ = -(1-\lambda^2)\big(\langle A_0u, BUu\rangle + \langle B^*u, A_1Uu\rangle\big), \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\langle A_0u, BUu\rangle + \langle B^*u, A_1Uu\rangle = -\lambda\big(\|A_1Uu\|^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - \|\Lambda_0u\|^2\big), \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$\Lambda_0 := (I + |X|^2)^{1/2}(A_0 + BX)(I + |X|^2)^{-1/2} \tag{2.8}$$

is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\mathfrak{A}_0$.

Remark 2.3. (2.6) represents [20, identity (2.7)]. The identity (2.7) is obtained by combining two remaining identities from [20, Lemma 2.2] (see [20, identities (2.8) and (2.9)]).

Below we will only discuss the spectral disposition (1.1). Sometimes, we will need its more detail description.

Hypothesis 2.4. *Assume Hypothesis 2.1. Let $\sigma_0 = \mathrm{spec}(A_0)$ and $\sigma_1 = \mathrm{spec}(A_1)$. Suppose that the open interval $\Delta = (\gamma_l, \gamma_r) \subset \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma_l < \gamma_r$, serves as a finite gap of the spectral set σ_1 and $\sigma_0 \subset \Delta$. Let $d = \mathrm{dist}\big(\sigma_0, \sigma_1\big)$.*

Now we want to reproduce a known result regarding the position of the spectrum of the perturbed operator $L = A + V$ and a known result on the solvability of the associated Riccati equation (1.6) in the spectral case (1.1). Both these results have been established in [18] within an approach that is completely alternative to the methods and technique employed later on in [19].

Theorem 2.5. *Assume Hypothesis 2.4. Also assume that*

$$\|V\| < \sqrt{d|\Delta|}. \tag{2.9}$$

Then:

(i) *The spectrum of the block operator matrix L consists of two isolated parts $\omega_0 \subset \Delta$ and $\omega_1 \subset \mathbb{R} \setminus \Delta$. Moreover,*

$$\min(\omega_0) \geq \gamma_l + (d - r_V) \quad \textit{and} \quad \max(\omega_0) \leq \gamma_r - (d - r_V), \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$r_V := \|V\| \tan\left(\frac{1}{2}\arctan\frac{2\|V\|}{|\Delta| - d}\right) < d. \tag{2.11}$$

(ii) *There exists a unique solution $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1)$ to the operator Riccati equation* (1.6) *with the properties*

$$\mathrm{spec}(A_0 + BX) = \omega_0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{spec}(A_1 - B^*X^*) = \omega_1. \tag{2.12}$$

Moreover, the spectral subspaces $\mathfrak{L}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\big)$ and $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_1)\big)$ admit the graph representations $\mathfrak{L}_0 = \mathcal{G}(X)$ and $\mathfrak{L}_1 = \mathcal{G}(-X^*)$ associated with the angular operators X and $-X^*$, respectively.

Remark 2.6. The formulations in items (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.5 are borrowed from [20, Theorem 2.4]. Assertion (i) follows from [18, Theorem 3.2]. The assertion (ii) is obtained by combining the statements from [18, Theorem 2.3] and the existence and uniqueness results for the Riccati equation (1.6) proven in [18, Theorem 1 (i)].

3. The bound on rotation of the spectral subspace and its new proof

The a priori sharp norm bound for the operator angle between the unperturbed and perturbed spectral subspaces $\mathfrak{A}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)\big)$ and $\mathfrak{L}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\big)$, involving not only the distance d but also another parameter, the length $|\Delta|$ of the spectral gap Δ, has been established for the first time in [19, Theorem 5.3]. This has been done under the requirement

$$\|V\| < \sqrt{d(|\Delta| - d)} \tag{3.1}$$

stronger than the condition (2.9) in Theorem 2.5. The main assertion in [19, Theorem 5.3], written in terms of the norm of the difference $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0) - \mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)$ of the spectral projections $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)$ and $\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)$, is as follows.

Theorem 3.1 ([19])**.** *Assume Hypothesis 2.4. Assume, in addition, that inequality* (3.1) *holds. Then*

$$\|\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0) - \mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\| \leq \sin\left(\frac{1}{2}\arctan\varkappa\big(|\Delta|, d, \|V\|\big)\right) \quad \left(< \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\omega_0 = \mathrm{spec}(L) \cap \Delta$ *and the quantity* $\varkappa(D,d,v)$ *is defined for*

$$D > 0, \quad 0 < d \leq \frac{D}{2} \qquad 0 \leq v < \sqrt{d(D-d)} \tag{3.3}$$

by

$$\varkappa(D,d,v) := \begin{cases} \dfrac{2v}{d} & \text{if } v \leq \dfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{d\,(D-2d)}, \\[2ex] \dfrac{vD + \sqrt{d(D-d)}\,\sqrt{(D-2d)^2 + 4v^2}}{2\big(d(D-d) - v^2\big)} & \text{if } v > \dfrac{1}{2}\sqrt{d\,(D-2d)}. \end{cases}$$

As it was underlined in the Introduction section, our main goal is to present a proof of Theorem 3.1 that does not depend on the approach used in [19] and, in addition, is simpler then the proof in [19].

We first prove the bound (3.2) in a particular case where the absolute value $|X|$ of the angular operator $X \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{A}_0, \mathfrak{A}_1)$ from the graph representation $\mathfrak{L}_0 = \mathcal{G}(X)$ has an eigenvalue equal to the norm of X. The proof is done by making a straightforward estimate of this eigenvalue. The general case is easily reduced to the above particular case by using a quite common limit procedure, involving orthogonal projections onto the elements of a sequence of expanding finite-dimensional subspaces in $\mathfrak{A}_0$ (see, e.g., the proof of [20, Theorem 4.1]; cf. the proof of [24, Theorem 4.2]). In view of its commonality, we skip this part of the proof.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Throughout the proof, we assume, without loss of generality, that the interval Δ is located on $\mathbb{R}$ symmetrically with respect to the origin, that is, $\gamma_r = -\gamma_l = \gamma$. Otherwise, one may always make the replacement of A_0 and A_1 respectively by $A_0' = A_0 - cI$ and $A_1' = A_1 - cI$ where $c = (\gamma_l + \gamma_r)/2$ denotes the center of the interval Δ. Obviously, such a replacement does not affect the property of the operator X to be the solution of the transformed equation (1.6).

The assumptions $\sigma_0 \subset \Delta = (-\gamma,\gamma)$ and $d = \operatorname{dist}(\sigma_0,\sigma_1) > 0$ imply $\sigma_0 \subset [-a,a]$ where $a = \gamma - d$. At the same time

$$\|A_0\| = a, \tag{3.4}$$

$\gamma = a + d$, and the condition (3.1) may be written as

$$\|V\| < \sqrt{d(2a+d)}. \tag{3.5}$$

Let X be the very same (unique) solution to (1.6) that is spoken about in the item (ii) of Theorem 2.5. By our assumptions, $V \neq 0$ (see Hypothesis 2.1) and, hence, $X \neq 0$. Suppose that the absolute value $|X|$ of the operator X has an eigenvalue μ coinciding with the norm of X, i.e.,

$$\mu = \big\||X|\big\| = \|X\| > 0, \tag{3.6}$$

and let u, $\|u\| = 1$, be an eigenvector of $|X|$ corresponding to this eigenvalue, $|X|u = \mu u$. Since $\mu \neq 0$ and $u = \frac{1}{\mu}|X|u$, one concludes that $u \in \operatorname{Ran}(|X|)$ and, due to (2.5),

$$\|Uu\| = \|u\| = 1, \tag{3.7}$$

where U is the isometry from the polar decomposition $X = U|X|$. By Lemma 2.2 we also know that $Uu \in \operatorname{Dom}(A_1)$ and that the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu\big(\|A_1Uu\|^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - \|A_0u\|^2 - \|B^*u\|^2\big)& \\ = -(1-\mu^2)\big(\langle A_0u, BUu\rangle + \langle B^*u, A_1Uu\rangle\big),&\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

$$\langle A_0u, BUu\rangle + \langle B^*u, A_1Uu\rangle = -\mu\big(\|A_1Uu\|^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - \|\Lambda_0u\|^2\big), \tag{3.9}$$

where Λ_0 is a bounded self-adjoint operator on $\mathfrak{A}_0$ being expressed through A_0, B, and X by (2.8).

The similarity (2.8) implies that $\operatorname{spec}(\Lambda_0) = \operatorname{spec}(A_0 + BX)$ and, hence, by Theorem 2.5 (ii) we have $\operatorname{spec}(\Lambda_0) = \omega_0$. From the assertion (i) of the same theorem it then follows that $\|\Lambda_0 u\| \leq \gamma - (d - r_V) < \gamma$, i.e.

$$\|\Lambda_0 u\| < a + d, \tag{3.10}$$

Notice that the spectrum of A_1 lies outside the interval $\Delta = (-a-d, a+d)$. Together with (3.7) this means

$$\|A_1Uu\| \geq a + d. \tag{3.11}$$

In view of (3.10) and (3.11) we find

$$\|A_1Uu\|^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - \|\Lambda_0u\|^2 > (a+d)^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - (a+d)^2 \geq 0.$$

Then the relations (3.6) and (3.9) require the strict inequality

$$\langle A_0u, BUu\rangle + \langle B^*u, A_1Uu\rangle < 0. \tag{3.12}$$

On the other hand, because of (3.4) and (3.5) one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_1Uu\|^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - \|A_0u\|^2 - \|B^*u\|^2 &\geq (a+d)^2 - a^2 - \|B\|^2 \\ &= d(2a+d) - v^2 > 0,\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where, for shortness, we use the notation

$$v = \|B\| \quad (= \|V\|).$$

Due to (3.12) and (3.13), the identitity (3.8) yields

$$\mu < 1. \tag{3.14}$$

Taking into account (3.13) and (3.14), one can rewrite (3.8) in the form

$$\frac{\mu}{1-\mu^2} = -\frac{\langle A_0u, BUu\rangle + \langle B^*u, A_1Uu\rangle}{\|A_1Uu\|^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - \|A_0u\|^2 - \|B^*u\|^2} \quad (>0)$$

and then conclude that

$$\frac{\mu}{1-\mu^2} \leq \frac{a\|BUu\| + v\|A_1Uu\|}{\|A_1Uu\|^2 + \|BUu\|^2 - a^2 - v^2}. \tag{3.15}$$

Set

$$x = \|A_1Uu\| \quad \text{and} \quad y = \|BUu\|.$$

In view of (3.11) we have $x \in [a+d, \infty)$. At the same time $y \in [0, v]$. This means that, in any case, the following bound holds:

$$\frac{\mu}{1-\mu^2} \leq \sup_{(x,y)\in\Omega} \varphi(x,y), \tag{3.16}$$

where $\Omega = [a+d, \infty) \times [0, v]$ and

$$\varphi(x,y) := \frac{vx + ay}{x^2 + y^2 - a^2 - v^2}. \tag{3.17}$$

Elementary calculations show that the largest value of the function φ on the set Ω is reached at the piece of the boundary of this set corresponding to $x = a+d$ and $y \in [0, v]$. Namely, if $0 < v \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}da}$, then the maximum of φ on Ω is provided by the point $x = a+d$, $y = v$. If $\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}da} < v < \sqrt{d(2a+d)}$, then the function φ achieves its maximmal value on Ω at $x = a+d$ and

$$y = \frac{a[d(2a+d) - v^2]}{v(a+d) + a\sqrt{d(2a+d)(a^2+v^2)}} < v.$$

Substitution of the respective maximum point into (3.17) results in

$$\sup_{(x,y)\in\Omega} \varphi(x,y) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{v}{d} & \text{if } v \leq \sqrt{\dfrac{1}{2}da}, \\ \dfrac{1}{2}\dfrac{v(a+d) + \sqrt{d(2a+d)}\sqrt{a^2+v^2}}{d(2a+d) - v^2} & \text{if } v > \sqrt{d(2a+d)}. \end{cases} \tag{3.18}$$

Taking into account that

$$\frac{\mu}{1-\mu^2} = \frac{1}{2}\tan(2\arctan\mu),$$

and recalling that $\mu = \|X\|$, $v = \|V\|$, and $a = \frac{1}{2}|\Delta| - d$, from (3.14), (3.16), and (3.18) one derives that

$$\|X\| \leq \tan\left(\frac{1}{2}\arctan\varkappa(|\Delta|, d, \|V\|)\right). \tag{3.19}$$

By Theorem 2.5 (ii), the spectral subspace $\mathfrak{L}_0 = \mathrm{Ran}\big(\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\big)$ is the graph of the operator X. Hence, the norm of the difference of the orthogonal projections $\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0)$ and $\mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)$ is expressed through $\|X\|$ according to (1.7) (see, e.g., [17, Corollary 3.4]). In view of (1.7), unequality (3.19) is equivalent to the estimate (3.2). Thus, for the case where the absolute value $|X|$ has an eigenvalue coinciding with $\|X\|$, the proof is complete.

In the case where $|X|$ does not have an eigenvalue equal to $\|X\|$, the proof is reduced to the case already considered by almost literally repeating the reasoning used in [20] to prove the corresponding estimate for $\|\mathsf{E}_A(\sigma_0) - \mathsf{E}_L(\omega_0)\|$ when $\sqrt{d(|\Delta| - d)} \leq \|V\| < \sqrt{d|\Delta|}$ (see [20, Theorem 4.1]). Having done this reference to [20], we consider the whole proof of Theorem 3.1 complete. □

It only remains to recall (see the proof of [19, Theorem 2]), that the assertion of Theorem 1 for $\|V\| < d$ is a simple corollary to the more detail estimate (3.2). For the sake of completeness, we give, nevertheless, a necessary explanation.

Proof of Theorem 1 for $\|V\| < d$. Since $|\Delta| \geq 2d$ and $\|V\| < d$, inequality $\|V\| < \sqrt{d(|\Delta| - d)}$ holds automatically. Consequently, by Theorem 3.1 one has the bound (3.2). Notice that for fixed values of $\|V\|$ and d satisfying $\|V\| < d$, the quantity $\varkappa(D, d, \|V\|)$ represents a nonincreasing function of the variable $D \in [2d, \infty)$. This function acquires its maximum at $D = 2d$, and the maximum equals

$$\max_{D: D \geq 2d} \varkappa(D, d, \|V\|) = \varkappa(2d, d, \|V\| = \frac{2\|V\|d}{d^2 - \|V\|^2} = \tan\Big(2 \arctan \frac{\|V\|}{d}\Big).$$

Thus, (3.2) yields (1.3). □

Remark 3.2. Optimality of the bounds (1.3) for $\|V\| < d$ and (3.2) for $\|V\| < \sqrt{d(|\Delta| - d)}$ is confirmed by the respective concrete matrix examples (see [19, Example 5.5 and Remark 5.6] and [20, Example 4.4 and Remark 4.5]).

This research was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research and by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). The support by St. Petersburg State University (grant # 11.38.241.2015) is also acknowledged.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Bhatia, C. Davis, and A. McIntosh, *Perturbation of spectral subspaces and solution of linear operator equations*, Linear Algebra Appl. **52/53**, 45–67 (1983).
[2] C. Davis and W. M. Kahan, *The rotation of eigenvectors by a perturbation. III*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **7**, 1–46 (1970).
[3] T. Kato, *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1966.
[4] S. Albeverio and A. K. Motovilov, *Bounds on variation of the spectrum and spectral subspaces of a few-body Hamiltonian*, arXiv:1410.3231 (2014).
[5] S. Albeverio and A. K. Motovilov, *Sharpening the norm bound in the subspace perturbation theory*, Compl. Analysis Oper. Theory **7**, 1389–1416 (2013).
[6] A. Seelman, *Perturbation Theory for Spectral Subspaces*, Ph.D. thesis, Johannes Gutenberg University, Mainz, 2014 (available online at http://ubm.opus.hbz-nrw.de/volltexte/2014/3862/).
[7] Y. A. Kuperin, K. A. Makarov, S. P. Merkuriev, and A. K. Motovilov, *Algebraic theory of extensions in the quantum few-body problem for particles with internal structure*, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **48** (1988), 224–231.
[8] Y. A. Kuperin, K. A. Makarov, S. P. Merkuriev, A. K. Motovilov, and B. S. Pavlov, *Extended Hilbert space approach to fewbody problems*, J. Math. Phys. **31**, 1681–1690 (1990).
[9] A. K. Motovilov, *Removal of the resolvent-like energy dependence from interactions and invariant subspaces of a total Hamiltonian*, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 6647–6664 (1995).
[10] A. K. Motovilov, *The removal of an energy dependence from the interaction in two–body systems*, J. Math. Phys. **32**, 3509–3518 (1991).
[11] B. H. J. McKellar and C. M. McKay, *Formal scattering theory for energy–dependent potentials*, Australian J. Phys. **36**, 607–616 (1983).
[12] R. Mennicken and A. A. Shkalikov, *Spectral decomposition of symmetric operator matrices*, Math. Nachr. **179**, 259–273 (1996).
[13] A. S. Markus and V. I. Matsaev, *Spectral theory of holomorphic operator-functions in Hilbert space*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **9**, 73–74 (1975).
[14] H. Langer, A. Markus, V. Matsaev, and C. Tretter, *A new concept for block operator matrices: The quadratic numerical range*, Linear Algebra Appl. **330**, 89–112 (2001).
[15] C. Tretter, *Spectral Theory of Block Operator Matrices and Applications*, Imperial College Press, London, 2008.
[16] S. Albeverio, K. A. Makarov, and A. K. Motovilov, *Graph subspaces and the spectral shift function*, Canad. J. Math. **55**, 449–503 (2003).

[17] V. Kostrykin, K. A. Makarov, and A. K. Motovilov, *Existence and uniqueness of solutions to the operator Riccati equation. A geometric approach*, Contemp. Math. **327**, 181–198 (2003).
[18] V. Kostrykin, K. A. Makarov, and A. K. Motovilov, *On the existence of solutions to the operator Riccati equation and the tan Θ theorem*, Integr. Equations Oper. Theory **51**, 121–140 (2005).
[19] A. K. Motovilov and A. V. Selin, *Some sharp norm estimates in the subspace perturbation problem*, Integr. Equations Oper. Theory **56**, 511–542 (2006).
[20] S. Albeverio and A. K. Motovilov, *The a priori tan Θ Theorem for spectral subspaces*, Integr. Equations Oper. Theory, **73**, 413–430 (2012).
[21] A. Seelman, *Notes on the sin 2Θ Theorem*, Integr. Equations Oper. Theory **79**, 579–597 (2014).
[22] Y. Nakatsukasa, *The tan θ theorem with relaxed conditions*, Lin. Algebra Appl. **436**, 1528 - 1534 (2012).
[23] M. S. Birman and M. Z. Solomjak, *Spectral Theory of Self-Adjoint Operators in Hilbert Space*, D. Reidel Publishing, Dordrecht, 1987.
[24] V. Kostrykin, K. A. Makarov, and A. K. Motovilov, *A generalization of the* $\tan 2\Theta$ *Theorem*, Oper. Theory: Adv. Appl. **149**, 349–372 (2004).

A. K. MOTOVILOV, BOGOLIUBOV LABORATORY OF THEORETICAL PHYSICS, JINR, JOLIOT-CURIE 6, 141980 DUBNA, MOSCOW REGION, RUSSIA
E-mail address: motovilv@theor.jinr.ru